Dewan.—Do you want full Makkathayam, *i. e.*, would you exclude daughters who, under the Hindu Law, do not inherit except to a limited extent?

Member.—These are details which could be settled when the Bill is drafted.

The Member then quoted the opinion expressed by eminent men to the effect that Marumakkathayam was injurious to the community and prayed that the law might be amended as suggested by him.

Mr. T. S. Madhavan Pillai (Member, T. I. C., Changanachery) said that the Karnavan had no responsibility in educating the minor members of the tarwad even where the income admitted of expenditure in such useful directions. Under Section 10 of the Nair Regulation, the wife and minor children were entitled to maintenance, but they could not now *claim* it from the tarwad property. The provision was thus inoperative. He therefore prayed that the Regulation might be amended so as to allow individual partition. The Member added that he did not want Makkathayam.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

37. Desirability of allowing individual partition to a Nair tarwad when there is no female member surviving.

Mr. P. Krishna Pillai (Member, Eraniel taluk) said that his proposal was that, when there were no female members in a tarwad, the male members should have the liberty by law to partition the property among them. If any of the latter were to die before partition, his share should go to his wife and children. If partition was not made, the wife and children of the last surviving member alone would inherit the whole property. Replying to the Dewan, the Member said that he was not in favour of general partition and that his scheme did not include cases in which the last surviving members included one or more females past the age of child-bearing.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

38. Repeal of the Canals and Ferries Regulation.

Mr. Ouseph Chacko (Member, Ambalapuzha taluk) dwelt at length on the difficulties of the ryots of Kuttanad as the land was wholly under water during the greater part of the year. The use of boats was an inevitable necessity with them to allow them to move about from house to house. Each individual therefore possessed one small boat. In the cultivation season necessaries of life were transported in a boat. The children went to the school every day in a boat. Water for drinking purposes was brought in a boat. Under such circumstances, he compared the necessity for registering their boats to that of registering the feet of persons in other parts of the State, on the ground that they used them for moving about.

The Canals and Ferries Regulation had not its parallel in the Codes of other States. The necessity for such a law in Travancore was not evident. The Regulation had its operation only on the main waterway that stretched right across from the orthernmost extremity of Travancore to the confines of Trivandrum in the south nd on the approaches to most of the important towns of the State. About 90% of those waterways was the gift of nature and the outlay on the remaining portion was insignificant when compared with the cost of construction and maintenance of public roads in other parts of the State. The damage done to a waterway by the plying of boats was comparatively *nil*. The revenue derived by the Government under the Regulation was very small and was out of all proportion to the worry and trouble caused to the people. The tax on *valloms* could not be easily collected, the cost of collection was not low, the tax was not definite and capable of easy verification; in fact every canon of taxation was violated by the impost. He urged that the Regulation itself was unworkable. The exemption allowed in favour of private boats had no material advantages. The boundary line between private boats and boats plying for hire was indistinguishable and depended mainly on the discretion of the authorities. He next dealt with the difficulties of the free pass system and quoted instances in which the working of the system turned out to be detrimental to the interests of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the poor ryots. The main objections to the Regulation were the existence of innumerable boats of all sizes, one or two even in the possession of the lowest paid cooly, the difficulty, delay and expense in getting them registered and re-registered every year even by fairly influential persons, the utter impossibility of the poorest classes complying with the terms of the Regulation and the unlimited room which the indefiniteness of the distinction between private boats and those plying for hire afforded to the subordinate agency for vexatious and extortionate dealings. Among the harassing provisions of the Regulation, he referred to the necessity for obtaining fresh certificates at every transfer of a *vallom* on payment of a whole year's fee at all such times, even in the case of those who hired a *vallom* for a day. A registry had to be effected when the *vallom* had undergone any repair. In the case of *kettuvalloms*, which had to be repaired frequently, the rule was a serious hardship. The rule requiring that, when a *vallom* was loaded, twelve inches of space ought to remain above the water line, the rule requiring that every boatman should be conversant with the Regulation, the rule requiring particular kinds of lights in all moving boats, the rule requiring that one man should always be present in a moored boat, were all framed without a real knowledge of the *valloms* of Kuttanad.

The Member said that the Regulation was an unmitigated piece of hardship and should therefore be repealed, and that the object in view could be achieved by framing and enforcing some rules to regulate the movements of motor boats, steam launches and other mechanically propelled conveyances. If the Government were particular about the revenue from the canals, a small cess on boats entering the tunnel at Varkalai, which was constructed at a great outlay, would fetch a considerably greater amount without so much worry and annoyance to the owners of private boats. He then presented a memorial signed by all the members praying that the Regulation might be repealed.

Dewan's reply.—The whole question will be carefully considered.

(2) Police.

39. Desirability of transferring the Anad and Vellanad pakuthies from the jurisdiction of the Vithurai Police Station to that of Nedumangad.

Mr. K. Narayana Pillai (Member, Nedumangad taluk) said that the pakuthies of Anad and Vellanad were nearer to Nedumangad than to Vithurai. The people of the pakuthies had to go a distance of 11 miles to Vithurai for preferring complaints to the Police. That entailed much delay, inconvenience and expense. The Member therefore requested that the above two pakuthies might be re-transferred to the jurisdiction of Nedumangad station. In reply to a query from the Dewan, he said that, if it was not possible to transfer the pakuthies to the Nedumangad station, the people would be satisfied if they were placed under the jurisdiction of the Kattakadai sub-station, which, the Member said, was 5 miles from Vellanad and 12 miles from Anad.

Dewan's reply.—The proposal made by the Member is now under the consideration of Government and something will be done to remove the inconvenience complained of.

(3) Criminal Justice.

40. Re-transfer to Parassala of the Stationary Magistrate's Court at Neyyattinkara.

Mr. R Narayana Pillai (Member, Neyyattinkara taluk) said that there were two Magistrates in the Neyyattinkara taluk from very early times. An attempt to reduce the number by abolishing the Magistrate's Court at Parassala was made in the time of Dewan Mr. Rama Row, but it was soon found that one Magistrate was not able to cope with the cases filed and that the people were put to immense difficulties and therefore the Magistrate's Court at Parassala was re-established. With the idea of separating the revenue and magisterial work, the transfer of the Parassala Magistrate's Court to Neyyattinkara was ordered, while, to attain the same object in other taluks, new courts were started at Colachel, Varkala, Paravur, Tiruvattar and other places. The present arrangement of having only one Magistrate for the whole of the Neyyattinkara taluk caused great hardship to the inhabitants

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly